1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, cal. Civ. Code §1788, et. seq. ("RFDCPA") which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices.

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

2425

### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendants conduct business in the State of California and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2).
  - 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Stetson, Maine 04488.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3) and is a "debtor" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code §1788.2(h).
- 8. Defendant Midland is a corporation specializing in debt collection with its principal place of business located at 8875 Aero Drive, San Diego, CA 92123.
- 9. Defendant MCM is a corporation specializing in debt collection with its principal place of business located at 5775 Roscoe Court, San Diego, CA 92123.
- 10. Defendant Encore is a corporation specializing in debt collection with its principal place of business located at 8875 Aero Drive, San Diego, CA 92123.
- 11. Defendants are "debt collectors" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6), and RFDCPA, Cal. Civ. Code §1788.2(c).

12. Defendants acted through their agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 13. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 14. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which

25

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS 17. 19

harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 15. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 16. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

- At all relevant times, Defendants were acting collectively, and attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff as the term is defined by the FDCPA at 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5) and the RFDCPA at Cal. Civ. Code §1788.2(f).
- 18. The alleged debt at issue derives from a Household Bank account, and arose out of transactions which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 19. Based upon information and belief, at all times relevant Defendant MCM was acting on behalf of Defendants Midland and Encore in attempting to collect this alleged debt.
  - 20. Plaintiff paid off all amounts owed for the Household Bank account in or around

2006, and disputes owing this debt in its entirety.

- 21. Throughout 2011, Defendants' representatives placed excessive telephone calls to Plaintiff on a near-daily basis, attempting to collect this debt that Plaintiff does not owe.
- 22. Plaintiff has told Defendants' representatives on numerous occasions that he does not owe the debt.
- 23. Between June and August of 2011, Defendants' representatives placed numerous telephone calls to Plaintiff's place of employment.
- 24. Plaintiff spoke with a "supervisor" during one telephone call and demanded that Defendants not call him at his place of employment; the "supervisor" promised that such calls to Plaintiff's place of employment would stop.
- 25. Despite the promise made by the "supervisor", and Plaintiff's demands that the calls to his place of employment stop, Defendants' representatives continued to call Plaintiff at his place of employment.
- 26. Defendants' actions as described herein were made with the intent to harass, abuse, deceive, upset and coerce payment from Plaintiff for a debt he does not owe.

### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

23

22

25

24

28. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in
favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The
remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit
& Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the
Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be
construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u> , 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir.
2002).

The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" 29. consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- Plaintiff reincorporates by reference all of the preceding paragraphs. 30.
- In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendants violated the FDCPA in one 31. or more of the following ways:

23

24

25

- a. Defendants violated of the FDCPA generally;
- Defendants violated § 1692c(a)(3) of the FDCPA by placing repeated telephone calls to Plaintiff at his place of employment, despite his repeated demands that such calls cease;
- Defendants violated § 1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff, in connection with the collection of the alleged debt;
- d. Defendants violated § 1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly;
- e. Defendants violated § 1692e of the FDCPA by acting in a way that is deceptive and misleading;
- f. Defendants violated § 1692e(2) of the FDCPA by making a false representation of the amount owed;
- g. Defendants violated § 1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- h. Defendants acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

# COUNT II DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 32. Plaintiff reincorporates by reference all of the preceding paragraphs.
- 33. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendants violated the RFDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

a. Defendants violated Cal. Civ. Code §1788.17, which mandates that every debt collector collecting or attempting to collect a consumer debt shall comply with the provisions of Sections 1692b to 1692j of the FDCPA inclusive.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, JIMMI BROWN, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. Actual Damages;
- b. Statutory damages;
- c. Reasonable attorney's fees and costs;
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, JIMMI BROWN, demands a jury trial in this

case.

DATED: 10/25/2011

15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C..

By

Amy L Bennecoff (275805)

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 East Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Telephone: (215) 540-8888

Facsimile (215) 540-8817

Email: abennecoff@creditlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

ch

Court Name: USDC California Southern

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CAS031993

Cashier ID: mbain

Transaction Date: 11/01/2011 Payer Name: KIMMEL SILVERMAN

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: BROWN V MIDLAND FUNDING

Case/Party: D-CAS-3-11-CV-002538-001

Amount: \$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: 1340 Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00

Change Amt: \$350.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.